



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,420	07/08/2003	Ronald Hegli	WEBSSEN.013C1	1267

20995 7590 07/16/2010
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2442

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/16/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
efiling@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,420	Applicant(s) HEGLI ET AL.	
	Examiner DOUGLAS B. BLAIR	Art Unit 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 19, 20, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 19, 20, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The applicant has amended claims 1, 19, and 20 and added claims 25 and 26. Claims 1-8, 19, 20, 25, and 26 are currently pending. The applicant's amendment to claim 1 has overcome the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 USC section 101 and the rejection has now been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/23/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Freund teaches a supervisor element that reads on the claimed "central device". See Figure 3A and the corresponding disclosure. The Examiner agrees with the differences that the applicant is arguing about the applicant's invention and the prior art however the applicant's claims do not require all communication from the client to pass through the "central device".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 19-20, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,987,611 to Freund et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,801,747 to Bedard and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,486,892 to Stern.

Art Unit: 2442

As to claim 1, Freund teaches a method of controlling user access to Internet sites, comprising: determining within a central device of a local area network (Supervisor in Figure 3A) an Internet site that a user is accessing (col. 28, lines 2-32); providing a timer; incrementing said timer with time spent accessing Internet site by said user and blocking said user from accessing the Internet site when said timer reaches a predetermined level (Figure 7A and col. 9, line 64-col. 10, line 43); however Freund does not explicitly teach limiting based on a content category of Internet sites. Freund does suggest that it may be beneficial to limit the access to certain types of content (col. 9, lines 38-41).

Bedard teaches a method of monitoring including a profile that can be used to control the amount of time that information can be accessed for a particular category of content (col. 7, line 65-col. 8, line 6, in this case television).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Freund regarding limiting the amount of time a user can spend on an internet site with the teachings of Bedard regarding monitoring time access to content categories because content categories would allow a user of Freund's system to more broadly characterize rules instead of having to type each website in manually as shown in Figure 7A of Freund. Also, Stern shows the use of the same profile and rules for managing both internet content and television content (such as that explicitly monitored in Bedard) and how the teachings from either type of content can apply to one another, especially in the context of the applicant's broadly claimed invention (See Summary and corresponding disclosure in Stern).

As to claims 2 and 3, Freund allows a user to pick any arbitrary amount of time (Figure 7A).

Art Unit: 2442

As to claims 4 and 5, Freund shows that the time limit can be in effect for one day (Figure 7A).

As to claim 6, a second rule can be plugged into Figure 7A of Freund for a second content category.

As to claim 7, Freund teaches logging activities (col. 9, lines 17-19).

As to claim 8, Freund does not state that the Freund invention applies to cached webpages. Therefore a user of the Freund-Bedard-Stern combination would not be restricted from cached web pages as is conventionally known.

As to claims 19 and 20, they are directed towards a system for implementing the method of claims 1 and 8 and are therefore rejected for the same reasoning as claims 1 and 8.

As to claims 25 and 26, the applicant's specification does not provide a limiting definition for the term internet gateway "system". The previously cited Supervisor reads on the claimed internet gateway "system" because it is clearly in communication and control over the internet gateway (col. 28, lines 29-32).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2442

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Lee can be reached on (571) 272-3967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442